

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 10, and 15 to further clarify the invention. The amendments to claims 1, 10, and 15 are clearly supported throughout the specification, *e.g.* page 14, lines 8 to 13 and page 2, lines 2 to 5 of the specification.

#### **Preliminary Matters**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim to foreign priority and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority documents was received.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on Form PTO/SB/08 A & B submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 4, 2003.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate acceptance of the drawings filed on December 18, 2001.

#### **Summary of the Office Action**

The Examiner objected to claim 15 and rejected claims 1-5 and 8-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

#### **Claim Objection**

The Examiner objected to claim 15 for a minor informality. Independently, Applicant has amended the claim and this coincidentally overcame all of the Examiner's problems with claim 15.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2003-0206605 to Anderson (hereinafter “Anderson”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments.

Independent claim 1, among a number of unique features, recites: “extracting process of extracting from a storage medium desired access units which are units of access of encoded data for a special reproduction; eliminating process of eliminating old time information for said access units; generating process of generating time information for said access units.”

That is, one of the technical features of an exemplary embodiment of the present invention is multiplexing encoded data and forming a transport stream for reproducing a sequence of access units (access units of video data) for fast feed (fast forwarding) and rewinding. In the case where video data stored in a storage device is reproduced in the aforementioned storage and reproduction system, it is desirable to provide a special reproduction processing function corresponding to fast feed and rewinding. It is necessary to selectively reproduce a sequence of access units (access units of video data), which become a subject of special reproduction, among the stored video data. It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense, the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of the claims mentioned above.

The Examiner alleges that Anderson discloses the unique features of claim 1. Anderson discloses digital audio/video clock recovery algorithm (§ 32) and discloses decoding bit streams but Anderson does not disclose or suggest the extraction process, elimination process, and generation process, as set forth in claim 1. That is, Anderson fails to disclose or suggest

extracting process of extracting from a storage medium desired access units which are units of access of encoded data for a special reproduction. Moreover, Anderson does not disclose eliminating process of eliminating old time information for said access units and generating process of generating time information for said access units. In other words, Anderson does not disclose the extraction of desired access units for a special reproduction such as extracting access units needed for reproduction during fast forward and rewinding. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, 8, and 9.

Next, independent claims 10 and 15 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, arguments presented with respect to claim 1 are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous reasons, therefore, independent claims 10 and 15 are patentably distinguishable from Anderson. Claims 11-14 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 10.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that claims 6 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully holds the rewriting of claims 6 and 7 in abeyance until arguments presented with respect to independent 1 have been reconsidered.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Application Number: 10/020,177


Attorney Docket No.: Q67629  
Art Unit: 2666

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 21, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: Q67629